HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM
MEETING MINUTES

January 27, 2011

These minutes summarize the meeting of the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) held on January 27, 2011, at the CH2M HILL offices in Oakland, California. Participants in the meeting included the BCT, which is made up of representatives from the Department of the Navy (Navy), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board). The City of San Francisco (City), their consultants, the Lennar team of developers, and Navy consultants also attended the meeting. These minutes describe the key points, decisions, and action items agreed to at the meeting. A list of attendees is included as Attachment A. The revised document review table is included as Attachment B. The action items from the meeting are included as Attachment C.

Navy Business/Action Items (Keith Forman, Navy)

Keith Forman (Navy, Base Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) began the meeting with introductions and a review of the action items from the December 2, 2010 BCT meeting:

Jim Whitcomb (Navy, Deputy Lead Remedial Project Manager [RPM]) will contact the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) about collecting samples at Building 313, 313A, and 322 sites while the excavation sites and trenches are still open. *In progress. Mr. Forman asked that Building 322 be distinguished as Parcel C-1 Building 322 because there was a Building 322 on Parcel C that was demolished 6 years ago.*

Ryan Miya (DTSC) will set up a meeting with CDPH to determine what samples are going to be collected at Parcels B and G and then pass the list onto the Navy. *Complete. Tracy Jue (CDPH) said that CDPH will not require anymore confirmation samples for Parcels B and G.*

Mr. Forman will send out a list of the community meetings scheduled for the rest of the year to - the regulators. *Complete.*

Mr. Whitcomb will provide a copy of the Radiological Program schedule to Steve Hsu (CDPH) in order to plan and schedule radiological scans and to prepare a list of site statuses. *In Progress. Mr. Hsu said that the IR 7/18 work is delayed until June 2011 because of the rain.*

Navy will provide a dose modeling memorandum for RAD for IR 7/18 to the BCT and set up a meeting. Mark Ripperda (EPA) said that they are waiting for the Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO) to finish it. This item was removed from the action item list.

Radiological Update (Chris Yantos, Navy)

Chris Yantos, (Navy, RPM) began the Radiological Program update. He showed a map of the radiological projects going on around the base. The Parcel B installation restoration (IR) site 7/18 cap is scheduled to be built in April. Within the Parcel E 500 Series project, there are two

structures and surrounding ground that will require a Class 1 survey to be conducted. Mr. Forman said that Building 810 is the next building that is ready for CDPH to inspect and conduct a final status survey (FSS) on. Mr. Forman noted that Building 810 can be coupled with anything that CDPH wants to also inspect at that time. He said that this is the lagging element for the Parcel B and Parcel G transfer. Ms. Jue said that once the area dries out, she wants to coordinate the inspection and Final Status Survey Reports.

Mr. Yantos provided an update on the Crisp Road/Parcel E sanitary sewer/storm drain (SS/SD) removal and the building surveys. The SS/SD removal, characterization, and remediation are complete. The backfill and site restoration are progressing. Buildings 406, 810, 414, 701, and 704 are all within the report-writing process. Field work is ongoing at the Building 707 triangle and the IR-04 scrap yard. The roads will need to be paved once the work is complete. The SS/SD removal began on the central portion of Parcel C on January 4, 2011. To date, 2,987 linear feet of pipe and 3,444 cubic yards of soil have been excavated. The FSSs for Building 272 and Building 271 were started. Task Specific Plans (TSPs) for Buildings 214 and 241 are under RASO review. The Navy has begun developing TSPs for Building 203 and the North Pier. Mr. Yantos noted that another boiler and furnaces have been found in Building 203 and a demolition plan is in progress.

The Navy worked to remove SS/SD lines through January 21, 2011. In work areas (WA) 24, 30, and 28, 6,800 cubic yards of material was excavated and 4,450 linear feet of pipe was removed. The Cesium (Cs)-137 detections were slightly above the action limits in the Manseau Street storm drain sediment. Building 313, 313A, and 322 sites were surveyed and samples. There were elevated levels of Cs-137 and Radium (Ra)-226 and the Navy is developing a remediation plan.

The Navy conducted a gamma walk-over survey and Field Instrument for the Detection of Low Energy Radiation (FIDLER) survey on the Gun Mole Pier. The FIDLER is a new walk-over scan instrument introduced by RASO. It is a slow process similar to the Gamma ray. There have been no detections above the investigation levels. The Navy also completed a gamma walk-over survey on the South Pier; there were no detections above the investigation levels. The Navy completed the removal and stockpiling of asphalt, rails and ties from the South Pier. The electrical relocation for the Gun Mole Pier FAA light was completed. The Navy also began a radiological characterization survey and sampling on the South Pier; there were no detections above the investigation levels and they are awaiting analytical results. The Navy completed the radiological survey of Building 274; there were no detections above the investigation levels. The building demolition of the non-radiologically impacted buildings on the South Pier and on the Gun Mole Pier was completed. Mr. Yantos noted that they have started the foundation removal for Building 383, the old police building.

The Navy will continue to excavate the soil and remove the SS/SD pipes in WA 24, 30, 28, and 29. They are also planning to complete the remediation and resurvey of Buildings 313, 313A, and 322 sites. They will complete the characterization survey and sampling for the South Pier and start the asphalt removal and characterization survey and sampling for the Gun Mole Pier. The characterization survey and sampling for the Building 383 area will be completed and the survey unit project reports (SUPRs) will be submitted for Navy/RASO approval to begin backfilling of the trenches. Mr. Yantos showed several pictures of the radiological work on the

Gun Mole Pier and the metal buildings. A lot of the scrap is being recycled; there are a lot of railroad ties that they are trying to free release and not scrap.

Mr. Yantos briefly discussed the Parcel E 500 Series Building and Site surveys. The Navy is currently developing project work plans for the SS/SD removal and site clearing activities. The Final Execution Plan was submitted on January 20, 2011, and the Draft Design Plan was submitted on January 5, 2011. The clearing and grubbing is expected to begin during the week of January 24, 2011.

Mr. Yantos announced that all of the Parcel B building surveys have been completed. CDPH took five samples for confirmatory analysis on December 3, 2010. He noted that they are 53 days into the 80-day time clock. The Navy is reviewing the Building 140 Discharge Tunnel Draft Technical Memorandum. Sites 114, 142, 103, 113, 113A, 130, and 146 have been approved for unrestricted release. The Navy would like to attach the technical memorandum to the Building 140 Final FSS.

The Parcel G Building Surveys are complete. CDPH took receipt of samples for confirmatory analysis on December 3, 2010. Buildings 351, 351A, 401, 408, 411, and 439 have been approved for unrestricted release. Mr. Yantos showed a graph of the Parcel B and G building statuses.

Mr. Yantos provided an update on the on-site laboratory. The Basewide Execution Plan, including the Sampling Analysis Plan (SAP), has been issued and is under regulatory review. The new on-site radiological laboratory is operational. Six of the 12 detectors are operational; two are being installed and calibrated, with the remaining four to be in place by the end of February 2011. All 12 detectors are state-of-the-art ORTEC units housed in reduced background enclosures using 60-percent efficient, high purity Germanium (HPGe) crystals. The on-site laboratory has continued to operate using the 186 kEV peak method and the laboratory has been converted to the same "tuna can" geometry used by Test America. The on-site soil samples preparation has been modified to follow the Test America procedures. The Navy is evaluating options to gain Department of Defense (DoD) accreditation of the on-site laboratory. Mr. Ripperda asked if the counting times will be increased. Mr. Yantos did not know, but said that they will get back to EPA.

Mr. Forman noted that this is a perfect time to give the annual update to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) in Building 606. Mr. Yantos noted that they are trying to figure out how to survey Building 606 because it was built directly on top of former Building Site 503. Ms. Brownell said that the City wants the SFPD to move because development is going to happen. She said the more the Navy tells SFPD about the work going on, and how bad a place it really is, the more encouragement that will be to get them to move. Ms. Brownell said that their sewer lines and drain lines are lying on the street and are going to have to be moved eventually anyway.

Mr. Forman wants to set up a site tour of the pier for the regulators. Jackie Dunn (Navy, RPM) said the first week of April will be a good time. She agreed to send an email to set it up.

Mr. Yantos asked for any additional questions. Mr. Ripperda asked about the dirt handling procedures on Manseau Street. He said that it does not look like the Navy is using very thorough

procedures. Mr. Yantos said Shaw worked with Matt Slack (RASO) to fine-tune the process. Mike McGowan (Arc Ecology) asked about the license exemption. Mr. Ripperda said the area is potentially radiologically impacted and DTSC requires a license for handling radiological waste. The Navy is exempt because it is covered under their current license. The Navy is doing dose modeling because it helps the post-conveyance procedures. Mr. McGowan asked if there will be more sites that require a license exemption. Ms. Brownell said Parcel E and the Parcel E shoreline. The City does not want property that has a radiological license.

(PCB) Hot-Spot Area TCRA Project Status Update (Lara Urizar, Navy)

Lara Urizar (Navy, RPM) showed a new picture of Parcel E-2 time critical removal action (TCRA) and summarized the presentation outline. The Navy mobilized to the field on June 7, 2010, and completed the surface debris removal in Tiers 1, 2, 3, and 5. The debris was segregated, processed, and screened for radioactivity. The concrete was resized for reuse as temporary shoreline protection. Two wells located within the excavation footprint were abandoned. The Navy has constructed 29 radiological screening yard (RSY) pads to date, using material imported by barge. Crews began work in Tiers 3 and 5 in August 2010. Surface scans of the debris were conducted in 1-foot lifts. Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH) was identified during the excavation of Tiers 3 and 5 on September 1, 2010. MPPEH processing is not required for Tiers 1, 3, and 5. To date, 100 percent of the Tier 3 grids have been excavated and confirmation samples. About 30 percent of the Tier 5 grids have been excavated to depth. Ms. Urizar noted that the Tier 3/5 boundary samples had tetrachloroethylene (PCE) concentrations higher than the project action level (PAL) at 3 and 8 feet below ground surface (bgs). Ulrika Messer (Shaw) said there were non-detect levels of radiation and metals, except for manganese. Mr. Miya asked if the exceedance was at the bottom or on the side of the excavation. Ms. Messer said that it was a bottom sample. The Navy plans to over-excavate into Tier 3. A 1,400-foot silt curtain was installed in September 2010 and the Tier 2 excavation began in October 2010. Ms. Messer explained that excavation activities were suspended in December due to the lack of space to place excavated soil on the RSY pads. All current soil on RSY pads has been cleared from MPPEH and the Navy is working with RASO to radiologocally clear the soil. Six new pads were constructed in December 2010 and January 2011. Ms. Urizar stated that the site was shut down from December 23, 2010, through January 3, 2011, for the holidays. A skeleton crew remained on site during the holiday shut-down to perform routine stormwater inspections and maintenance, maintin site security, and respond to any emergencies. There were no problems encountered during the site shut-down. There was measureable precipitation on 13 out of 22 days in December and approximately 5.1 inches of rain fell prior to the holiday shut-down. Two 20,000-gallon frac tanks were mobilized to the site as a preventative stormwater-control measure. The rain water was pumped from the RSY pads to the frac tranks and then sampled. The sample results are still pending. Ms. Urizar asked Ms. Messer if the frac tank storm water had been tested. Ms. Messer answered that the water is non-detect for chemicals. Ms. Messer said that they would like to use the water for dust control but at this time it will be hauled off-site as waste. Ross Steenson (Water Board) said that once he sees the lab results and radiological results he does not see a problem with using it for dust control. Mr. Ripperda said that EPA would have no problem using the water for dust control as long as Water Board approves.

A NOSSA audit was conducted on December 14, 2010, and there were only five minor findings. Of the five findings, three were addressed the day of the audit and two will require editorial changes to the ESS. Ms. Urizar summarzied the upcoming schedule. The hot-spot excavation and soil screening will continue through late July 2011. Six more RSY pads are planned to be constructed in January and February 2011. The Navy will continue backfill and site restoration activities throught July 2011 and demobilization is scheduled for early August 2011. The draft version of the Removal Action Completion Report (RACR) will be submitted for review in October 2011.

IR 7/18 Remedial Action Update (Lara Urizar, Navy)

Ms. Urizar discussed the accomplishments of the Parcel B IR 7/18 Remdial Action activities. The Navy performed a pre-cover land survey of the entire IR 7/18 surface. The Navy mobilized a soil offloading barge and began cover soil import at the rate of 3,600 tons per day. The Navy also began transport of the soil from the barge offloading area using a local trucking service - five trucks looping for 8 hours per day, and began placing and compacting the first soil lift. Soil cover constuction was halted due to heavy rains in December 2010, but constuction will resume in mid-April at the start of the dry season. The pre-excavation characterization sampling to delineate 9 of 11 hot spots was completed; two hot spots are not accessible in Parcel D-1. The sidewall and bottom confirmation sampling was performed and completed. Two of the nine hot spots required step-out excavation in one direction. Additional confirmation samples collected at these two locations will verify complete removal of the hot-spot material. Excavation of B3426 required at least one additional step-out excavation; the removal is ongoing. All hot spots except B3426 were backfilled. Ms. Urizar said they are proposing a different sampling scheme because the contamination is thought to be due to lead-based paint (LBP) at Building 123. They are proposing sampling 20 feet out from the building, three different samples on each side, and taking samples from the paint on the building. Amy Brownell (City) said not to bother with the sampling. Mr. Ripperda said he would talk to Bob Carr (EPA) about LBP. The EPA's current plan is to not make the Navy dig up LBP, just other lead contamination. Mr. Forman asked what meets the threshold of properly demostrating that the lead release has become LBP. The Navy does not want to excavate because they do not want to create a moat around the building. Karla Brasaemle (Tech Law, Inc.) said that her previous company had them conduct a LBP survey of the bases in northern California. She said that there were usually paint chips in the soil. Ms. Urizar asked what the range of contamination was. Ms. Brasaemle said that they had all different concentrations. John Sourial (ERRG) said that they will photodocument the building and even sample the paint on the building. Mr. Forman said there will be a couple of paragraphs in the report to explain the Navy's process. Mike McGowan (Arc Ecology) asked that if samples are going to be collected, the Navy needs to answer the question to everyone's satisfaction. Mr. Miya said that the key for him is that there is going to be a cover and no exposure pathway. Ms. Urizar pointed out the stockpiles on a map and summarized the schedule. She noted that CDPH will be able to do the post-cover scans of the site after July 1, 2011.

RU-C5 Treatability Study Update (Hamide Kayaci, Navy)

Hamide Kayaci (Navy, RPM) focused her presenation on the the options for sulfate polish. Ms. Kayaci said they chose to focus on the three plumes (IR25MW16A, IR25MW11A, and

IR25MW68A) based on the data from three post-fracture monitoring events, evaluation of carbon distribution, changes in geochemistry, and chemical of concern (COC) degradation.

The hydraulic fracturing was completed in July 2010. A total of 11 fracture boreholes were advanced, including soil fracture wells (SFWs) and plume fracture wells (PFWs). The radius of influence was 15 to 20 feet from the fracture location and more than 34,000 pounds of EHC was emplaced. Ms. Kayaci showed graphic representation of the degradation process at each well.

Ms. Kayaci explained that the volatile fatty acids actually spike because it shows that fermentation is taking place. She noted that the degradation process is looking promising. Tamzen Macbeth (CDM) said that the ethenes are degrading. Ms. Kayaci discussed the decision criteria for the sulfate polish. The decision criteria include the following:

1. The absense of parent compounds (i.e., highly chlorinated benzenes and ethenes) or concentrations below PALs.

2. The presence of reductive daughter products (i.e. benzene, and/or VC) above PALs.

3. No increases in the total molar mass of COCs and reductive daughter products were observed in groundwater (increases in total molar mass indicate that contaminant mass is continuing to diffuse/desorb from the aquifer matrix).

Ms. Kayaci presented the decision criteria table. Ms. Macbeth said they are balancing several different criteria to determine if polish is needed. The conditions cannot degrade benzene and they anticipated that polish would be needed for benzene. The options are to wait for chlorobenzene and 1,4 dichlorobenzene to go below the PALs and polish with sulfate or to conduct a carbon injection to reduce chlorobenzene, 1,4 dichlorobenzene and then polish benzene with sulfate.

Mr. Miya asked that if they wait, what is the likelihood that the level will reach the desired level. Mr. Miya said he does not know if waiting will benefit or not. Mr. Ripperda said he votes for not waiting. Ms. Macbeth said that they fractured but did not intersect the well. They are waiting to see if the injections will diffuse from the fractures and see if there is an effect in the wells; but because of the gradient it may be months before results are seen. She anticipates the effect to eventually show up, because methane has made it to the wells. The most recalcitrant compounds are the benzenes and the carbon needs to be present for the degradation to occur. Mr. Miya clarified that the chlorobenzenes are more recalcitrant; the hypothesis is that they have not reached enough anaerobic conditions for degradation to occur. Ms. Macbeth said they have the data in the data packets available for review. She said that dechlorination is occuring but the predominant compound is dichlorobenzene. The dichlorobenzene is changing to benzene, just slower than hoped. Sarah Kloss (EPA) asked if the sulfate will be injected directly into the well. Ms. Macbeth said that direct injections are problematic because of the low permeability soils. They are going to try to intersect the fracture network. Jeff Austin (Geosyntec) asked if it would be the goal of a fracture project to not intersect the fracture network. The goal is to put enough fractures in the project so the volume that is being treated will be treated eventually. Mr. McGowan asked if there needs to be a second injection or if the range of data is enough. Ms. Macbeth answered that they have confidence in the level of carbon that needs to be in the system

to get it to the source of the contamination. Ms. Kayaci said that she needs to look at the budget to see if the work can actually be completed under this project. Ms Kito said that the Parcel C Remedial Design is coming down the pike for review and that anything that cannot be finished on this project will be added to the Remedial Action contract. Ms. Kayaci said that it would be almost impossible to modify the current contract because there are no funds available. They will try to horse-trade and move things around to include it. Ms. Kito noted that since HPS has such a big budget they wipe out all funds available. Ms. Macbeth said there is budget to do both the carbon and sulfate injections. She said they will trade the sulfate for the carbon injections. Mr. Miya asked if the concentrations of sulfate are a result of the chlorobenzene. Ms. Macbeth said that it is a definite indicator that things are not reducing enough. Ms. Kayaci said they will swap sulfate for lactate. Ms. Kito said that since they are out there already she wants to go ahead with the lactate injections. Ms. Kayaci presented the website where one can check to see the weekly results. Ms. Macbeth presented a quick overview of the website. There are summary charts that show the total energy used and added, power usage and how it relates to temperature, and mass removal so they can track the amount of vapor removed; the curve increases dramatically once the target temperature is met. Mr. Miya asked how there is a mass removal of dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) and light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL). Ms. Macbeth said there are knockout drums that separate the DNAPL and LNAPL. Ms. Macbeth noted they can copy, paste, and export any of the tables or figures on the website. They are tracking total energy. They are using less energy than anticipated. Ms. Kayaci summarized the conclusions and the calendar of events.

Parcel E Feasibility Study Status (Jackie Dunn, Navy)

Jackie Dunn (Navy, RPM) said that one of the goals of the presentation is to determine if another working meeting is needed or not. Ms. Dunn said there will be a shoreline protection technical memorandum included in the feasibility study (FS) appendix. Ms. Dunn discussed the shoreline protection technical memorandum. She wants to know what the most cost-effective and implementable approach is. The existing shoreling at Parcel E contains sediment that is potentially impacted with metals, PCBs, pesticides, and radionuclides. The shoreline is contiguous with IR Site 02 (IR-02), which is identified as radiologically impacted and contains extensive subsurface contamination. The draft FS report evaluated remedial alternatives for the Parcel E shoreline. One primary shoreling protection option (surface excavation and installation of protective revetment) was identified and was evaluated in conjection with the soil alternatives. The shoreline protection was combined with soil covers at IR-02 to form the primary containment alternative (common to Alternatives S-2 through S-5). An agency comment received on the draft FS report requested that natural shoreline protection options for all of or part of the shoreline in addition to rock revetment. The Navy responded that they will develop effective shoreling remedial options that are cost effective and implementable, given the Parcel E site conditions. The appendix to the draft final FS report evaluates several options for natural and hybrid stabilization structures and identifies the most promising natural or hybrid stabilization option to be used in combination with the shoreline revetment option presented in the draft FS report.

Ms. Dunn discussed the types of shoreline protection options—armoring, shoreline nourishment, and shoreline stabilization. The technical memorandum will evaluate options that combine structural and nonstructural stabilization methods. She showed a figure that detailed the steep and narrow shoreline and the gradually sloped and wide shoreline areas. The technical memorandum goes through the decision logic for shoreline recommendations and results. They are looking at natural shoreline materials and an offshore reef. Doug Bielskis (ERRG) discussed the shoreline options. The focus has been narrowed down to two hybrid stabilization options. The conditions at Parcel E are very different from Parcel B IR 7/18, but the options from IR 7/18 were used as a jumping off point. They are proposing course sand with a filter fabric and a reef to dissipate the wave energy to avoid erosion of the remedy. He discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the natural shoreline materials with offshore reef. There are quite a few disadvantages with the natural shoreline. Mr. Miya asked BCDC if this type of reef is amenable. BCDC said that if the benefits outweigh the downfalls then they are okay with the remedy. Ms. Kloss asked if the exisiting slopes are stable, why do they need additional stabilization. Mr. Bielskis said that they may need reinforcement to improve the stability. They want to put something in place that in the long run will prevent risk to human health and the environment. Mr. Bielskis stated that this would not be a true natural shoreline but a hybrid version of one. Mr. McGowan said that he is glad they are moving to a natural shoreline, and he would like them to use natural materials such as oyster shells. He said there are a lot of advantages to using oyster shells.

Mr. Bielskis described the proposed natural shoreline materials with underlying rock armor and the advantages and disadvantages associated with it. Ms. Dunn said this is what is going to be in the technical memorandum. Ms. Kloss clarified that they want to stabilize the shoreline as a Basewide issue. Ms. Dunn said that IR-02 encompasses the entire shoreline. Mr. Bielskis said that there are areas that do not have elevated concentrations of contaminants but the problem is the radionuclides in the shoreline material. Ms. Kloss said that she is disappointed that it seems like everything needs to be stabilized. Mr. Forman said that it has been clear since 2002 that every foot of shoreline of HPS is going to be sheetpile walled, reveted, etc. He said that it ensures an insurance policy for the agencies that the shoreline is anti-migration. Ms. Brasaemle said that the IR-26 peninsula is the only natural part of HPS the rest is fill material. Mr. Forman said that it is like DTSC's push to have a cap on every part of HPS; it's just an extension of that cap. Mr. McGowan said it is nice to have a push for natural. He wants the Navy to look at something that is more natural and easy to maintain. Ms. Dunn said that they are talking about an area that a removal action has already taken place. Ms. Brownell said that the request is to set up a meeting to hear the ideas for the shoreline. She clarified that the Navy should not do anything that is not reversible. Ms. Kloss said that the Navy wants to contain the whole shoreline. Mr. Miya said that it is consistent with what DTSC wants the Navy to do. Ms. Kito asked Mr. McGowan and Rafael ??? to give input on how to use the options. Mr. McGowan wants the berm to be made of oyster shells; he thinkgs the proposed berm is overkill.

Ms. Dunn discussed the next steps. She pointed out that the open space area increased in the redevelopment plan and there is not a multi-use space. She said that they had to look at the hot spot and exceedances and how that changed the FS and the redevelopment plan. She said that there will be an increase in soil cover and an slight decrease in asphalt because asphalt is expensive. There will be a decrease in the soil thickness from 3 to 2 feet, which is consistent with the current analysis. She said that this is all in line with that has been done at other parcels. Ms.

Braesamle asked that the area that could not be excavated in the PCB hot-spot time-critical removal action (TCRA) will become part of the this PCB hot-spot area. Mr. Forman clarified that they are doing hot-spot remedial actions instead of hot-spot removal actions. Ms. Dunn asked if another meeting is needed. Mr. Miya said that he needs to get back to the Navy so he can discuss with other state agencies. Mr. Forman said that he would like to hold the meeting on February 23, 2011. Ms. Dunn said that they can do an over the shoulder review instead of a working meeting, but Mr. Miya still wanted to discuss with the agencies first. Ms. Dunn summarized the schedule to conclude the presentation.

Basewide Groundwater Program Status (Hamide Kayaci, Navy)

Ms. Kayaci discussed the overview of the presentation. She gave background of the March 2009 SAP and discussed what had changed since then. The Parcel B well list was based on the Remedial Action Monitoring Plan (RAMP) dated 1999. Parcels C, E, E-2, D-1, and G well lists are based on draft Remedial Investigation (RI)/FSs dated 2007. The SAP needs to be updated to make the target analyte lists, analytical methods, wells, and water level measurement list consistent with the documents based on the Record of Decision (ROD) documents, the RDs with RAMPs, and the new FSs. With BCT concurrence, the Basewide Groundwater Monitoring Plan (BGMP) well list was revised in the third quarter of 2010 to align with RODs/RAMPs/FS reports minus the analytical methods, which require a SAP for implementation. The revised SAP was provided to the BCT for review in December 2010. The BCT approved implementing revised lists and draft SAP during the review period. She said that this was put together to identify the trends and why there needs to be an amendment to the SAP model. Mr. Miya asked if the semi-annual frequency is consistent with the RAMPs. Ms. Kayaci responded that the frequency is consistent with the RAMPs. Bruce Rucker (CE2) said that the plumes shown on the maps are not current plumes and there is not a current data set on the plumes. Ms. Kloss noted that the presentation and maps are very helpful because she did not attend the meeting where all of the monitoring wells were reduced. Gary Goodemote (Kleinfelder) explained that the well list will change on a yearly basis. Ms. Kayaci discussed each parcel and the current monitoring plan. The draft amended final SAP was submitted on December 13, 2010. The review period was extended until February 2, 2011. Ms. Kayaci mentioned a groundwater working meeting on February 23, 2011.

Community Involvement Update (Keith Forman, Navy)

Mr. Forman began the community involvement update. He said that the unoffical internal draft of the Community Involvement Plan (CIP) is available for the agencies to review. The Navy is asking for feedback and comments on the internal draft by February 15, 2011. The draft version of the CIP is scheduled to be released to the full BCT and the community on March 1, 2011, with a 30-day comment period. The interviewees will receive the draft CIP in either a electronic or hard-copy format. The Navy plans to send an e-mail annoucing that the CIP is available for comment. Multiple copies will be at the Anna Waden library and also available for download from the Navy's Web site. Mr. Forman noted that the CIP is written in a "*USA Today"* style with a lot of pictures, graphics, and sidebars. It also includes an appendix explaining why the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was dissolved. Mr. McGowan commented that he liked the idea of the new format for the document. All comments regarding the CIP will be required to be in a written format and the Navy is developing ways to help the public provide comments. As

recommended by EPA, the CIP will be the topic of discussion for the March commmunity meeting. Mr. Forman noted that there may have to be more than one meeting to cover the CIP in detail with the community members. He discussed the option of having the community meetings in new locations in the Bayview-Hunters Point community in order to reach a larger group of people. Ms. Brownell commented that she liked the idea of having a set date and set location for the monthly community meeting. Mr. McGowan suggested the ecology center located on Heron's Head for a possible location for future community meetings. Ms. Brownell also suggested that there will be a new building on base that could be a possible meeting location.

Mr. Forman explained that the Navy is experimenting with new meeting formats and new locations to determine the best approach for the community meetings. They are also using different approaches to distribute print material including churches, by foot, kiosks, by mail, and door-to-door hangers.

Mr. Forman asked to have feedback and comments on the CIP by February 15, 2011.

Action Items/Future Meetings (Keith Forman, Navy)

The next meeting will be held on February 23, 2011, at CH2M HILL in Oakland. Action items are included as Attachment C at the end of these minutes. The next community meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2011. The topic is to be determined.

ATTACHMENT A:

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET

Topic: BCT Meeting
Location: CH2M Hill
Oakland, CA
Date/Time: January 27, 2011 / 10:00 a.m.

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Navy	Keith Forman	619-532-0913	keith.s.forman@navy.mil	X
	Melanie Kito	619-532-0787	melanie.kito@navy.mil	X
	Jim Whitcomb	619-532-0952	james.h.whitcomb@navy.mil	
	Lara Urizar	619-532-0960	lara.urizar.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Hamide Kayaci	619-532-0930	hamide.kayaci.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Chris Yantos	619-532-0952	christopher.yantos.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Simon Loli	619-532-0782	simon.loli.ctr@navy.mil	
	Laurie Lowman	757-887-7650	laurie.lowman@navy.mil	
	Matt Slack	757-887-4212	matthew.slack@navy.mil	
	Zack Edwards	757-887-4692	zack.edwards@navy.mil	
	Chris Dirscher	510-749-5947	christopher.dirscher@navy.mil	X
	Frank Fernandez	510-749-5936	franklin.d.fernandez@navy.mil	
	Jarvis Jensen	757-887-4483	jarvis.jensen@navy.mil	
	Adam Zwiebel	510-749-5947	adam.zwiebel@navy.mil	
	Shane Wells	510-749-5922	robert.s.wells@navy.mil	
	Jackie Dunn	619-532-0777	jackie.dunn@navy.mil	X
	Bob Hunt	619-532-0962	robert.a.hunt.ctr@navy.mil	
U.S. EPA	Mark Ripperda	415-972-3028	ripperda.mark@epa.gov	X
	Sarah Kloss	415-972-3156	kloss.sarah@epa.gov	X
DTSC	Ryan Miya	510-540-3775	rmiya@dtsc.gov	X
	Michelle Dalrymple	510-540-3926	mdalrymple@dtsc.ca.gov	
RWQCB	Ross Steenson	510-622-2445	rsteenson@waterboards.ca.gov	X
CDPH	Jeff Wong	510-620-3423	jeff.wong@cdph.ca.gov	X
	Tracy Jue	916-324-4808	tracy.jue@cdph.ca.gov	X
	Kurt Jackson			
	Larry Morgan			
	Steve Hsu	916-440-7940	steve.hsu@cdph.ca.gov	X
CDFG	Charlie Huang	916-324-9805	chuang@ospr.dfg.ca.gov	
	Tammy Nakahara	916-324-8452	tnakahar@ospr.dfg.ca.gov	
City of SF	Amy Brownell	415-252-3967	amy.brownell@sfdph.org	X
	Sigrida Reinis	415-955-9040	sreinis@treadwellrollo.com	X
	Dorinda Shipman	415-955-9040	dcshipman@treadwellrollo.com	
Geosyntec	Jeff Austin	415-218-0027	jasustin@geosyntec.com	X
BVHP/Lennar	Steve Rottenborn	408-458-3205	srottenborn@harveyecology.com	

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Tech Law Inc., *EPA contractor*	Karla Brasaemle	415-281-8730	kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com	X
Navy contractors				
Tetra Tech EM Inc.	Steve Hall	619-321-6709	steve.hall@ttemi.com	
	Tim Mower	313-312-8874	tim.mower@ttemi.com	
Tetra Tech EC, Inc.	Bill Dougherty	415-216-2731	bill.dougherty@tetratech.com	
Sealaska Environmental Services	Lauren Cason	619-564-8329	lauren.cason@sealaska.com	X
CE2	Bruce Rucker	925-400-4586	rucker@ce2corp.com	X
	John Copland	925-463-7301	copland@ce2corp.com	
Kleinfelder	Gary Goodemote	510-628-9000	ggoodemote@kleinfelder.com	X
	Gabriel Fuson	510-774-4115	gfuson@kleinfelder.com	X
	Charlie Almestad	510-628-9000	calmestad@kleinfelder.com	X
KCH	Leslie Lundgren	415-541-7110	leslie.lundgren@ch2m.com	X
ERRG	Doug Bielskis	925-726-4119	doug.bielskis@errg.com	X
	John Sourial	415-848-7103	john.sourial@errg.com	X
ITSI	Jim Schollard	925-946-3107	jschollard@itsi.com	
	Brett Womack	925-250-8077	bwomack@itsi.com	
	Ken Leonard		kleonard@itsi.com	
Jonas and Associates	Gilbert Yousif	415-559-8232	gyousif@jonasinc.com	X
Shaw Group	Wayne Akiyama	925-288-2003	wayne.akiyama@shawgrp.com	
	Steven Pierce	925-288-2139	steve.pierce@shawgroup.com	
	Ulrika Messer		ulrika.messer@shawgrp.com	X
Battelle	Cannon Silver	619-424-7606	silverc@battelle.org	
	John Hardin	619-574-4827	hardinj@battelle.org	
MACTEC	Jeff Fenton	707-544-6134	jjfenton@mactec.com	X
	Dharme Rathnayake	415-278-2111	drathnayake@mactec.com	
	Ray Hendy		lrhendy@mactec.com	
URS	Jerry Zimmerle	714-433-7738	jerome.zimmerle@urscorp.com	
TN & Associates	Suman Sharma	510-223-1344	ssharma@otiesolutions.com	
	Mike Quillin	925-286-9043	mquillin@onsesolutions.com	
CDM	Tamzen Macbeth	208-569-5147	macbethtw@cdm.com	
	Matt Brookshire	858-268-3383	brookshirems@cdm.com	
Arc Ecology	Mike McGowan	415-643-1190	mikemcgowan@arcecology.org	X
BCDC	Ethan Lowry	732-309-2934		
	Rafael Montes	415-352-3670	rafael@bcd.ca.gov	X
	Ian McConnaba	510-590-6027		

ATTACHMENT B-1: COMPLETED REVIEW PERIODS
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
1	D-1,D-2,G	Draft Final TPH Closure Report	10/10/10	11/8/10				11/12/10	
2	UC	Draft - Package 33 Survey Unit Project Reports (164,167,168,171))	10/12/10	11/11/10					
3	D-1	Draft Final Remedial Design and Specifications	10/15/10	11/15/10				12/6/10	12/6/10
4	B	Final SUPR for Survey Unit 10 (54,57,58,60,64)	10/20/10	n/a					
5	UC	Final – Package 13 Survey Unit Project Reports (133, 136, 137, and 138)	10/21/10	n/a					
6	E	Draft SUPR for Inner Area Package 1	10/28/10	11/28/10					
7	B	Final FSS Report Building 157	11/17/10	n/a					
8	UC	Final - Package 33 Survey Unit Project Reports (164,167,168,171))	11/19/10	n/a					
9	UC-1,UC-2	Draft UC 1&2 RAD RACR	11/23/10	30 days from submittal date			12/22/10		

ATTACHMENT B-2: CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
1	C	Final Parcel C Design Work Plan for Areas 31,32,33,34,35	11/29/10	n/a					
2	Base-wide	Basewide Final Dust Control Plan Rev 1	11/29/10	n/a					
3	Basewide	Final Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan(sanitary storm drain removal)	11/29/10	n/a					
4	Basewide	Basewide Draft Amended SAP GWMP	12/8/10	1/13/11					1/10/11
5	E	Draft SUPR for Survey Units 152,154,155,156, Work Package #34.	12/8/10	1/7/11					
6	B	Final Remedial Design and Specifications	12/10/10	n/a					
7	**G**	Revised Draft Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Survey Units 85,86,87,88,89, ParcelG, Work Package #25, Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Removal Project, Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, CA	12/16/10	1/16/11					
8	B/G	Draft FOSET	12/16/10	1/14/11		1/13/11	1/13/11	1/4/11	1/17/11

ATTACHMENT B-2: CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
9	B	Draft Final TPH Closure Report volume II	12/17/10	12/15/10					1/12/11
10	B,D-1,G,UC2	Final Work Plan for Soil Gas Investigation in Support of Vapor Intrusion Assessment Parcels B, D-1,G and UC-2/	12/17/10	na					
11	B	Draft Final Petroleum Hydrocarbon Site Closeout Report Parcel B, Volume II	12/17/10	1/10/11					
12	G	Draft - Package 29 Survey Unit Project Reports (108, 109, 110, 11, 112)	12/17/10	1/17/11					
13	B,D-1,G,UC-2	Final Soil Gas Survey Workplan	12/17/10	n/a					
14	G	Draft SUPR for Survey Units 113,114,116,117,118, Work Package #30.	12/20/10	1/20/11					
15	G	Draft - Package 30 Survey Unit Project Reports (113, 114, 116, 117, 118)	12/20/10	1/20/11					
16	G	Draft - Package 31 Survey Unit Project Reports (119, 120, 121, 122, 123)	12/21/10	1/21/11					

ATTACHMENT B-2: CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
17	UC1,UC2	Final Remedial Design Package Parcels UC1 and UC2	12/22/10	na					
18	G	Draft Survey Unit Project Reports for Survey units 124,129,151,153,84 Parcel G, Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Removal Project. Work Package #32	12/22/10	1/21/11					
19	UC-1,UC-2	Final Remedial Design and Specifications	12/22/10	n/a					
20	G	Draft - Package 32 Survey Unit Project Reports (124, 129, 151, 153, 84)	12/22/10	1/22/11					
21	B	Draft RAD RACR	1/6/11	2/6/11					
22	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package 9 (42,45,47,52)	1/13/11	n/a					
23	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package (15,17,18,29,40)	1/13/11	n/a					
24	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package 5 (23,25,26,27,28)	1/13/11	n/a					

ATTACHMENT B-2: CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
25	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package 6 (24,39,43,44,46)	1/13/11	n/a					
26	B	Final SUPR for Survey Area 18 (37,48,49,51A)	1/13/11	n/a					
27	B	Final SUPR for Survey Area 19 (53,56,65)	1/13/11	n/a					

ATTACHMENT B-3: UPCOMING REVIEW PERIODS
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
1	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package 17 (36,59,61,62,63)	1/24/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
2	B	Final SUPR for Survey Package 11 (125,126,127,128,130,131,132)	1/24/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
3	B	Final SUPR for Survey Area 20 (50,50A,51,55))	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
4	B	Final TPH Closure Report	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
5	UC	Final – Package 14 Survey Unit Project Reports (139, 140, 141, and 142)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
6	UC	Final – Package 15 Survey Unit Project Reports (143, 144, 145, and 146)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
7	UC	Final - Package 16 Survey Unit Project Reports (147, 148, 149, and 150)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				

ATTACHMENT B-3: UPCOMING REVIEW PERIODS (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
8	G	Final - Package 21 Survey Unit Project Reports (66, 67, 68, 69)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
9	G	Final – Package 12 Parcel G Building Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR 100, 101, 102, 115)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
10	G	Final - Package 26 Survey Unit Project Reports (90, 91, 92, 93, 94)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
11	G	Final - Package 27 Survey Unit Project Reports (95, 96, 97, 98, 99)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
12	G	Final - Package 28 Survey Unit Project Reports (103, 104, 105, 106, 107)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
13	G	Final - Package 29 Survey Unit Project Reports (108, 109, 110, 11, 112)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
14	G	Final - Package 30 Survey Unit Project Reports (113, 114, 116, 117, 118)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				

ATTACHMENT B-3: UPCOMING REVIEW PERIODS (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
15	G	Final - Package 31 Survey Unit Project Reports (119, 120, 121, 122, 123)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
16	G	Final - Package 32 Survey Unit Project Reports (124, 129, 151, 153, 84)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
17	G	Final - Package 24 Survey Unit Project Reports (79, 80, 81, 82, 83)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
18	G	Final - Package 22 Survey Unit Project Reports (70, 71, 72, 73)	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
19	F	Final Radiological Data Gap Investigation Work Plan	1/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
20	B,D-1,G,UC-2	Draft Soil Gas Survey Tech Memo	1/31/11	30 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				
21	Basewide	Draft Supplemental EIS (DEIS)	2/1/11	45 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				
22	C	Draft Remedial Design	2/1/11	30 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				

ATTACHMENT B-3: UPCOMING REVIEW PERIODS (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
23	E	Draft Work Plan IR 03	2/4/11	30 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				
24	E-2	Final Work Plan for Geotechnical Investigation	2/8/11	n/a	Date is tentative				
25	D-1	Final Remedial Design and Specifications	2/11/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
26	Basewide	2nd & 3rd Qtr 2010 Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report	2/15/11	n/a	Date is tentative				
27	B,D-1,G,UC-2	Final Soil Gas Survey Tech Memo	2/15/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
28	B/G	Draft Final FOSET	2/18/11	30 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				
29	E-2	Final Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study	2/28/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				
30	E-2	Final Radiological Addendum for the RI/FS with RTCs	2/28/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				

ATTACHMENT B-3: UPCOMING REVIEW PERIODS (continued)
HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
31	E-2	Draft Proposed Plan (to BCT)	3/7/11	30 days from submittal date	Date is tentative				
32	E	Final TPH CAP Work Work Plan	3/30/11	n/a	Final date based on receipt of comments				

Notes:

*	Comments deferred to other agency	PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
CAP	Corrective Action Plan	ROD	Record of decision
CDPH	California Department of Public Health	RI	Remedial investigation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control	RTC	Response to comment
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	RWQCB	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
FOSET	Finding of suitability for early transfer	SF	San Francisco
FOSL	Finding of suitability to lease	SUPR	Survey Unit Project Report
FOST	Finding of suitability to transfer	TCRA	Time critical removal action
FS	Feasibility study	TPH	Total petroleum hydrocarbon
FSS	Final status survey		
n/a	Not applicable		

ATTACHMENT C: HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM ACTION ITEMS

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
1	Mr. Whitcomb will get in contact with CDPH about collecting samples at the Buildings 313, 313A, and 322 sites while the excavation sites and trenches are still open.	Jim Whitcomb, Navy		Jim Whitcomb, Navy	In progress. Mr. Forman asked that Building 322 be distinguished as Parcel C-1 Building 322 because there was a Building 322 on Parcel that was demolished 6 years ago.
2	Jim Whitcomb will provide a copy of the Radiological Program schedule to Steve Hsu (CDPH) in order to plan and schedule radiological scans and a list of site statuses.	Jim Whitcomb/Navy		Jim Whitcomb/Navy	In Progress. Steve Hsu (CDPH) said that the IR 7/18 work is delayed until June because of the rain.
New Action Items					
3	Tracy Jue (CDPH) will find out from Larry Morgan (CDPH) the status of the five samples submitted for confirmatory analysis from Building 157 and will send an email to Ryan Miya. Keith wants to have an update on the 53 days into the 80 day clock.	Tracy Jue/ Ryan Miya		Tracy Jue/Ryan Miya	
4	The Navy will find out if the count times have increased at the on-site laboratory.	Navy		Navy	
5	The Navy will provide the Water Board the rad results from the storm water in the frac tanks to determine if that water can be used for dust control.	Navy		Navy	

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
Outstanding Action Items					
6	Ross Steenson will check with Water Board to see if the water can be used for dust control.	Ross Steenson		Ross Steenson, Water Board	
7	Ryan Miya will get back to the Navy next week regarding the need for further investigation of potentially LBP contaminated soil around Building 123.	Ryan Miya		Ryan Miya	